



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

English translation as authority in details without first referring to the original for verification. It is to be hoped that when a second edition is called for, a careful and thorough revision will be made. Apart from its inaccuracy the translation is smooth, reads easily, and makes the book as attractive as any handbook can be expected to be. The English reader will be surprised to find how much progress has been made in formulating the principles and working out the details of the Science of Religion, while the large amount of work which is being done in the collection of religious facts and the organization of them will be more than surprising. The typography is excellent. The usual absence of an index, common to most English books,—the absence, we mean, not the index,—is, as usual, deplorable.

G. S. G.

The World of the Unseen. By ARTHUR WILLINK. New York: Macmillan & Co.

This book is a curiosity in literature. It is a product of that venturesome disposition of man which prompts him to seek a solution for every mystery. The author's avowed object is to show "that it is in higher space that we look for the understanding of the unseen." Our common habit of representing the future state of men as spiritual, and of assuming that spirit is of necessity invisible, seems quite unsatisfactory to him. He thinks that John's vision of the redeemed in the spiritual world was a vision of beings like unto ourselves. We do not see our departed friends because they dwell in "the higher space," not because they have become essentially unlike us. The difference is in the space. That in which they dwell is different in its conditions from ours. John was "in the spirit" when he had this vision.

An illustration of what this higher space may be is wrought out with much care, and with some ingenuity. Lower space is divided up as to dimensions, or, as our author prefers to say, directions. Each of these is in close connection with the others, but the conditions of each are different from those of the rest. The first is enclosed in a tube of infinite length, and although of no appreciable width, yet wide enough for an atom to be held in it. This is space in one direction. This tube moved laterally would describe superficial space of two directions. Adding now thickness we have space of three directions. These all lie together, and are parts of each other. But a being dwelling in space of only one direction could not see beings in superficial space, and those dwelling in superficial space could not see any being outside of their special relations. There may be points of contact, however, where these different kinds of space intersect each other, and he who stands at that point of contact may see, in higher spaces than his own, beings invisible to his fellows in the lower space. John, "in the spirit," stood at such a point of contact. Space of the "fourth direction" was open to his view. From that space came all spiritual beings, such as angels, who have shown themselves to men in this world, and back into that space they go. It was in the same way that the Master, after his resurrection, so mysteriously appeared and dis-

appeared in the presence of his disciples. He did not change his form as he went and came. He only changed his space relations.

What this fourth direction is Mr. Willink does not attempt to explain. He says that only a few favored souls can even picture it to their mind, and he is not one of *them*. It would seem as though one of these favored ones should have written the book. As it is, the work is of a very doubtful value. It is simply an attempt to explain a mystery by a mystery, and to common minds the mystery which is to explain will seem greater than the one to be explained.

B. F. S.

Guide to the Knowledge of God. By A. GRATRY, Professor of Theology at the Sorbonne. Translated by ABBY L. ALGER. Boston: Roberts Brothers.

This work in its original form has passed through many editions. The author starts out with a saying of Bossuet, which he quotes with approval, that "wisdom consists in knowing God and knowing one's self." He declines to regard the knowledge of God's existence as a first truth because man can disbelieve in God, and there are honest atheists. But he affirms that this knowledge "can be strictly proved, and that no geometrical theorem is more certain." Such knowledge is the "beginning and end of reason," and the basis of all philosophy.

An outline statement of the inductive and deductive methods of research is given with high commendation of induction. These methods find fuller illustration in the examination of the theodicy of Plato, and that of Aristotle,—two conspicuous examples of these two methods. The method of Plato, and the results obtained thereby receive the highest praise. The true idea of God as the good, and the true moral philosophy are traced back to the Socratic school. Goodness and the divine knowledge are ever inseparable, and in this the school of Socrates excelled. Aristotle, twenty years a pupil of Plato, accepted the results which he attained but sought to prove them by a process the opposite to that of his master. Aristotle is the father of deduction. He is substantially agreed with Plato, but his philosophy has not the directness nor simplicity of the Platonic system. Cicero said that the philosophy of the Academy and that of the Portico differed only in words. So says Mr. Gratry.

The author at least shows a very intimate acquaintance with these hoary philosophers. But in his enthusiasm he certainly interprets into their writings philosophic and theistic conceptions which are familiar enough today but were quite unfamiliar in the age of Plato. It is true that they sometimes use the word *Theos* to designate the Supreme Being. But did *Theos* mean to them just what it does to us? Did they ever think of a deity as personal in our sense of that word, and as separate from the universe? It seems very doubtful if they did. Our author is, moreover, a little inconsistent when he accepts Aristotle's definition of God as "pure act," and then refuses to accept Aristotle's theory of an eternal creation, which seems to be a logical sequence of